



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,699	03/17/2004	Christopher W. Blackburn	1842.030US1	3789
70648 7590 10/30/2008 SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/WMS GAMING P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402				
EXAMINER MOSSER, ROBERT E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3714				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/30/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.

10/802,699

Applicant(s)

BLACKBURN ET AL.

Examiner

ROBERT MOSSER

Art Unit

3714

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 09 October 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): USC 112 2nd paragraph of claim 1.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-26.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Dmitry Suhol/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714

/R. M./
Examiner, Art Unit 3714

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The applicant proposes on page 8 of their remarks dated October 9th, 2008 that a UDDI register arrangement such as provided by the prior art of Gatto does not specify how information is provided to the UDDI discovery service when the claimed limitation presents "sending service information for the accounting service from the accounting service to a discovery agent on the gaming network. As presented however the UDDI registry provides a lookup table for services on the gaming network enabling other network devices to post their services as available and enabling network components to search for services using the same UDDI. Wherein each device on the network may both provide and consume the network services provided (Col 15:57-67). It can be fairly simplified as presenting a directory for the services of a network such as accounting and auditing, etc. Gatto teaches the criticality of populating the UDDI directory through automated means to avoid the requirement of human interaction (Col 16:7-11), and further clarifies the operation of the invention through the automatic publication of device availability once connected to the network (Col 13:49-63). If as so alleged the UDDI registry was not automatically populated according to the presence of service such as the claimed the binding of the accounting service to the registry the system of Gatto would be incapable of recognizing the presence of network attached services and flowing there from would require outside interaction to update the UDDI register to presence of network services. Such interaction however is not taught by the Gatto reference which instead proposes the automatic population of UDDI responsive to the addition of a network service by the same network service.

Continuing on page 8 of the applicant's remarks dated October 9th, 2008, the Applicant proposes that the prior art of Gatto does not teach determining if the accounting service is authentic and authorized. Gatto however teaches the use of an authentication engine correlated in the rejection as presented as a component of the applicants so described discovery agent, as including operations to authenticate devices operations, and data integrity contained on the network (Col 10:44-52, 12:16-22). If as so alleged the prior art of Gatto did not consider the authorization of the devices attached to the network as taught above and previously cited then the inspection of messages sent across the network would fail to provide any measure of security because without determining the validity of the message origin the contents of the message cannot be assured.

The remainder of the applicant's arguments are based on the arguments addressed above and considered refuted therewith through their reliance thereon. .